



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,505	10/12/2001	Takayuki Asai	040447-0238	9792
22428 7590 01/06/2010 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
ENGLAND, DAVID E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/06/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

EX PARTE TAKAYUKI ASAI

Appeal 2009-004793
Application 09/975,505
Technology Center 2400

Oral Hearing Held: November 17, 2009

Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, JAY P. LUCAS, and CAROLYN D. THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

SHAUN R. SNADER, ESQUIRE
Foley & Lardner, LLP
3000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143

1 The above-entitled matter came on for oral hearing on Tuesday,
2 November 17, 2009, at The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany
3 Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Paula L. Lowery, Notary Public.

4
5 THE CLERK: Good morning, Calendar Number 53, Mr. Snader.

6 JUDGE BARRY: Welcome, Mr. Snader.

7 MR. SNADER: Good afternoon.

8 JUDGE BARRY: You have 20 minutes. We'll go ahead and use the
9 timer here. Please begin. We're on the record.

10 MR. SNADER: Thank you. There are a number of rejections on
11 appeal, a single anticipation rejection and a number of obviousness
12 rejections.

13 A common theme among those rejections is that the Wong reference is
14 either the only reference in the case of the anticipation rejection, and the
15 primary reference in the case of all of the obviousness rejections.

16 Although the rejections are all slightly different, they share a common
17 flaw. That common flaw is that the Wong reference doesn't teach the
18 monitoring of a residual memory as claimed in each of the independent
19 claims.

20 Rather, Wong suffers from the same infirmities identified in the
21 application, and that is that Wong sends a static piece of information the size
22 of the memory, rather than the residual memory.

23 I'm going to start out with a brief summary of the claimed subject
24 matter, and then discuss each of the rejections. Specifically, how Wong,

1 and Wong in combination with Ferguson, does not anticipate or render
2 obvious the claimed invention.

3 Claim 1, which is the claim that stands rejected among others, is the
4 anticipation rejection. It recites an object filtering method for filtering an
5 object. That method recites, among other things, comprising periodically
6 monitoring a residual amount of memory capacity in the client during such a
7 session by a plurality of monitoring results.

8 Based on those monitoring results, the client sends a filtering
9 condition to the proxy server. The proxy server, based on this filtering
10 condition, filters objects requested by the clients.

11 By monitoring the residual memory in this way, the claimed method
12 allows objects to be handled by the client more efficiently, specifically in the
13 prior art systems, as discussed on pages 1 and 2 of the specification, if an
14 object was received by the client that exceeded the residual memory capacity
15 of the client.

16 The client would have a couple of choices. It could either delete
17 objects to make room for the object, which may result in deleting necessary
18 or important objects, or could simply discard a requested object. This leads
19 to a certain amount of inefficiency.

20 By monitoring the residual amount of memory and allowing the proxy
21 server to filter objects based on this residual amount of memory, the proxy
22 server can ensure that the objects seen by the client -- there's sufficient
23 memory in the client to handle those objects.

1 JUDGE BARRY: Counsel, in your summary of the invention, which
2 I know you resubmitted, it would have been helpful if you could have done a
3 more specific mapping.

4 For instance, when it comes to the preamble, you just told us to see
5 elements 1 through 4. Obviously -- well, we had to do some figuring out. I
6 assume the terminal is the client, the gateway is the proxy server; but, you
7 see, neither one of those terms was used in the figure.

8 For instance, we're left to see which in your claim the server is. Is that
9 server 3 or server 4 from Figure 1?

10 MR. SNADER: The question was server 3 or 4 from Figure 1?

11 JUDGE BARRY: Right. Which of those corresponds to the claimed
12 server?

13 MR. SNADER: I believe either could correspond to that server, Your
14 Honor.

15 JUDGE BARRY: In future summaries, if you could go to that level of
16 specificity, that would help us understand and help us decide your case
17 better.

18 MR. SNADER: I appreciate the suggestion. I will certainly do so in
19 the future, Your Honor.

20 Turning now to the Wong reference, the Wong reference discloses,
21 and specifically the part relied upon by the Examiner in Column 5,
22 monitoring device capabilities and communicating those between a proxy
23 server and a content server.

24 Now, Wong discloses two examples of device capabilities. That's the
25 type of display and the size of the graphics memory. These generally

1 correspond to the capability -- the CPI discussed in the background portion
2 of the specification, pages 1 and 2.

3 Importantly, the type of display, of course, doesn't give you any
4 information about the residual memory at all. That simply refers to the
5 number of its color coding, as disclosed in Column 11, lines 17 to 25.

6 Likewise, the size of the graphics memory also does not tell you the
7 amount of the residual memory. It's talking about a total resolution size --
8 the total size -- a static quantity. Support for that can be found in Column
9 11, lines 17 to 25 for Wong.

10 The Examiner states in the Examiner's answer at pages 17 and 18 that
11 one can interpret the graphics memory as being empty. The gist of that
12 argument is that if Wong would disclose the device capabilities, including
13 the size of the graphics when the graphics memory is empty, that would be
14 the amount of residual memory because all of the memory is available.

15 JUDGE LUCAS: Mr. Snader, you said look at Column 11, and you
16 said that that would be the total size available. The idea is we have a device
17 with only so much display memory available, and you're trying to jam a
18 bigger picture in.

19 You're saying that in the Wong reference the specification given to the
20 server that's providing -- the device that's providing the image is the total
21 capacity of the small device, rather than the available space.

22 You said take a look at Column 11, and you pointed to some portion
23 of Column 11 around lines 15 to 30 for the support of that.

24 MR. SNADER: Yes.

1 JUDGE LUCAS: In which Wong was saying that that was the total
2 capacity of the memory, rather than what is available. I don't see this. I'm
3 having trouble, and I'm looking at lines 22 and 23 where it mentions the
4 megabytes.

5 Can you say how you can read this as the total capacity? The wording
6 here is indicating that this device can only display an image size of up to 3
7 megabytes with one color and coding.

8 That sounds more to me like an expression of the free capacity
9 because it's talking about the image that can be put in there, rather than the
10 total capacity of the video phone, or whatever device it is.

11 Please explain your interpretation.

12 MR. SNADER: Well, I think it's two-fold. The first part is I think the
13 size of the actual words themselves, the size of the display, when it
14 references that in Column 5 as an example of the device information that can
15 be sent.

16 JUDGE BARRY: So Column 5, line 58?

17 MR. SNADER: 58, yes.

18 JUDGE BARRY: Size of graphics memory.

19 MR. SNADER: Based on that language alone and in the context with
20 the type of display, I think it's clear from just those words that it is a static
21 information.

22 The second part is looking at Column 11, those words that you've just
23 identified. That phrase indicating that this device can only display an image
24 up to 3 megabytes in size.

1 I would interpret that as being consistent with the other language of
2 this static quantity, just like the type of display. That's talking about the
3 maximum size of the graphics, which would be consistent with the prior art
4 as described in the specification where it sends CPI information that's all
5 static quantities. Total display size, type of display, OS.

6 As further support for the fact this is a static quantity that's being
7 reported, it is important to look at how Wong is communicating this device.
8 If you look at Column 5, it talks about how Wong generates this, which it
9 refers to as receiver end information, which would include in some cases the
10 type of display and the size of the display.

11 What happens is that a table is produced by the proxy server. When
12 the proxy server receives an object request from the client, it matches up that
13 request with the client. Looks up the RHI information in the table and sends
14 it on to the content server.

15 Now, importantly here, the table is constructed and it's described on
16 lines 60 to 61. The table entry for a particular client device can be stored
17 when the device first registers with the ISP.

18 So when it first registers with the ISP, this information is taken from
19 the client by the proxy server and a table is created. If it was, in fact,
20 reporting a dynamic quantity, the amount of residual memory consistent
21 with the Examiner's interpretation of this, this technique wouldn't work.
22 Because you're only taking information once creating a table, and then
23 accessing that table repeatedly each time an object request is sent from the
24 client to the property server.

1 JUDGE LUCAS: I can understand why you say that in terms of
2 Column 5.

3 MR. SNADER: Okay.

4 JUDGE LUCAS: The wording that I saw in Column 11 is not
5 wording of the capacity of the phone, according to its specifications; but
6 rather, to repeat, it talks in terms of what the device can handle with regard
7 to an incoming image, "indicating this device can only display an image size
8 of up to 3 megabytes with certain encoding."

9 Now, that sounds to me like a statement of capacity -- available
10 capacity. What it can handle with regard to an incoming image.

11 Why must I abandon the plain wording of this reference on Column
12 11 in order to -- well, why must I abandon it at all?

13 MR. SNADER: Well, I don't think you have to abandon the plain
14 language of Column 11 that you identify.

15 Looking at it, I would read it, as I urged, that that's talking about a
16 static quantity. A total amount of memory, not a residual memory.

17 Now that you've explained your interpretation of it, I can see how
18 Column 11 could be ambiguous. You could interpret it the other way, the
19 way you described.

20 I think it's important that this be read in context with the rest of the
21 disclosure of Wong, including what's in Column 5, what I just talked about.
22 Column 5, to the extent there's some ambiguity here, I think resolves it
23 because it's talking about how you create the table.

24 The way it tells you to create the table and report the size of the
25 display can't be reconciled with the interpretation of language in column 11,

1 if that language is meant to be interpreted as meaning reporting the residual
2 amount of memory. It just wouldn't work.

3 JUDGE BARRY: In Column 11, lines 19 and 20 refer to looking up a
4 table of device capabilities, which is the same thing as Column 5 refers to in
5 lines 53 -- a table of device capabilities -- implying that they are the same
6 thing.

7 MR. SNADER: Exactly, Your Honor, and I think that's why you need
8 to read this in the context of both what's there in Column 11 and Column 5,
9 which describes how you create that table.

10 Column 5 makes it very clear that you create this table based on
11 polling devices when the device first registers with the ISP. You have this
12 RHI information, which is all static, and you simply pull the information out
13 of this table when the proxy server receives an object request from the client
14 device.

15 Also, going back to this language in Column 5 --

16 JUDGE BARRY: In fact, the Examiner's Answer relies on both those
17 together. It just doesn't pick a Column 11 teaching, but cites Columns 5 and
18 11 as if they are recognizing they're referring to the same thing.

19 MR. SNADER: That's correct. Of course the Examiner doesn't have
20 quite the same interpretation of it as we do.

21 JUDGE BARRY: No.

22 MR. SNADER: The Examiner does, of course, rely on both of those
23 together.

24 JUDGE BARRY: But it's telling us that on pages 3 to 4 of his Answer
25 he relies on them together. In fact -- well, he cites them together.

1 MR. SNADER: That's correct.

2 Reinforcing this interpretation is a fact that the claims call for periodic
3 monitoring. Going back to how this table is created, there's no periodic
4 monitoring of the graphics display of Wong. It's simply polled once, and
5 then the proxy server pulls that off the table.

6 So there's no periodic monitoring. It happens once, a table is created,
7 and that's it.

8 JUDGE BARRY: Counsel, you have about five minutes left. Do you
9 want to go to your Claim 12 because it is a different scope. There's another
10 reference. I'd think you'd want to get those arguments in.

11 MR. SNADER: I would, Your Honor.

12 JUDGE BARRY: Please do that.

13 MR. SNADER: The rejection based on Wong in view of Ferguson
14 suffers from the same general problems as the anticipation rejection based
15 on Wong.

16 Specifically, Wong is deficient with respect to commitment Claims 12
17 and 19 for the same reason we just talked about.

18 The Examiner cites Ferguson for some of the specific limitations in
19 Claims 12 to 19. Ferguson really is dealing with a completely separate
20 problem.

21 Ferguson is dealing with a method of downloading web content during
22 idle time.

23 JUDGE BARRY: Counsel, given our time constraints, let's jump to
24 Column 11 of Ferguson.

25 MR. SNADER: Okay.

1 JUDGE BARRY: Where we see -- very specifically, now we are
2 monitoring a residual amount of memory left. It happens to be a cache
3 memory, and we're sending a notification there.

4 The notification actually didn't mean -- there is no notification sent to
5 a proxy server.

6 JUDGE BARRY: I'm sorry, that's correct.

7 MR. SNADER: So what's happening there is as you've correctly
8 identified Column 11 is talking about the cache manager. The user sets a
9 size limit on the cache.

10 The cache manager, among other functions, monitors this and if the
11 cache hits a certain level it prompts the user to take action, either
12 automatically deleting old web content based on some algorithm, the user
13 deleting web content, increasing size of the cache, or simply ignoring the
14 warning.

15 JUDGE BARRY: Here's where we thought we had it. Since this is a
16 combination rejection, Wong in view of Ferguson, and we now have
17 Ferguson monitoring the threshold of used memory but not necessarily
18 notifying your proxy server about filtering conditions, looking at the
19 combination could Wong's rendering be that filtering condition?

20 MR. SNADER: Could Wong's rendering?

21 I'm sorry, by rendering are you referring -- I don't understand.

22 JUDGE BARRY: If you recall, Wong renders content to fit the
23 memory size of the PDA. So could that be the filtering condition?

24 MR. SNADER: It could not be the filtering condition because it's not
25 based on a plurality of monitoring results of the residual memory.

1 The cache is something entirely different than residual amount of
2 graphics memory. The cache is, you know, some amount of hard drive
3 space that is dedicated to downloaded content.

4 JUDGE BARRY: Right, but what the Examiner doesn't appear to be
5 relying on the cache per se but rather just the teaching of monitoring the
6 threshold. So if that's indeed what the Examiner is relying on, and we
7 combine the reference to his teachings, we now do have monitoring of
8 residual threshold of Wong's memory.

9 So the only hurdle we would have would be notifying of the filtering
10 condition. As you pointed out, Ferguson doesn't do that.

11 MR. SNADER: Yes.

12 JUDGE BARRY: So we are wondering along those lines, could the
13 filtering condition be the way in which Wong renders the image to fit the
14 amount of memory?

15 MR. SNADER: That could not be a filtering condition based on the
16 claims that are currently written.

17 JUDGE BARRY: Why is that?

18 MR. SNADER: Because the Wong reference is disclosing -- looking
19 at the total amount of memory available. So whatever image, among other
20 things type display, size display, so the image is compatible with that.

21 It's not actually filtering based on residual memory size. What you
22 would have here, if you combine these two references, is you would have to
23 have a complete redesign of Wong because the way Wong is set up -- and
24 going back again to how the table is constructed -- Wong would not be

1 capable of performing this function without completely changing the way
2 Wong operates.

3 You no longer have the table. You would have to -- rather than just
4 sending static information, you have to have some type of algorithm or some
5 type of program to monitor the residual memory, and send to this
6 periodically in real time as opposed to simply creating a look-up table when
7 the device first registers with the ISP.

8 JUDGE BARRY: Okay, thank you.

9 MR. SNADER: I hope I addressed your questions.

10 JUDGE LUCAS: We understand your position. Thank you.

11 MR. SNADER: Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded on Tuesday, November
13 17, 2009.)